

REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner: (i) rejects claims 1, 12, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; (ii) rejects claims 1, 3, 6-13, 15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,806,777 to Franca-Neto (hereinafter “Franca-Neto”); and (iii) rejects claims 2, 4, 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franca-Neto in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,186 to Ebihara et al. (hereinafter “Ebihara”).

In this response, Applicant: (i) amends independent claims 1, 12, 19 and 20; and (ii) traverses the various § 103(a) rejections, for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 1, 12, 19 and 20, Applicants have amended the independent claims to further clarify that the matching network comprises a series transmission line and a shunt stub. Applicants believe that the cited claim language is now completely clear.

By way of example only, FIG. 2 of the present application illustrates three matching networks, each matching network comprising a series transmission line (T2, T3 and T6, respectively) and a shunt stub (T1, T4 and T7, respectively). Thus, an input matching network comprises T1 (shunt stub) and T2 (series transmission line), an inter-stage matching network comprises T3 (series transmission line) and T4 (shunt stub), and an output matching network comprises T6 (series transmission line) and T7 (shunt stub).

Regarding the § 103(a) rejection, Franca-Neto fails to disclose each and every limitation of the claimed invention, and there is no motivation to modify Franca-Neto to attain the claimed invention.

The present invention, for example, as recited in amended independent claim 1, recites an amplifier comprising a first amplifying stage comprising a common-base transistor, a second amplifying stage, coupled to the first amplifying stage, comprising a cascode transistor pair, and at least one matching network comprising a series transmission line and a shunt stub. Independent claims 12, 19 and 20 recite certain similar limitations.

By way of example, Franca-Neto does not disclose at least one matching network comprising a series transmission line and a shunt stub. This is clear since the Examiner points to the circuit in Franca-Neto formed by resistor 122, inductor 124 and capacitor 126 in rejecting the claimed feature

of at least one matching network comprising a series transmission line and a shunt stub. The two circuit arrangements are significantly different.

The Examiner argues that an inductor and a transmission line are interchangeable. However, Applicant disagrees that an inductor is interchangeable with a series transmission line wherein the series transmission line forms a matching network with a shunt stub, as is expressly recited in each independent claim.

Applicant finds further fault with the rationale of the rejection, since it appears that the Examiner is attempting to use inductor 124 of Franca-Neto as part of both a shunt stub element and a series transmission line element in forming the rejection.

Thus, one ordinarily skilled in the art would find no motivation to modify Franca-Neto to attain the claimed invention.


For at least the above reasons, Applicant asserts that independent claims 1, 12, 19 and 20 are patentable over Franca-Neto.

Also, it is asserted that the claims that directly or indirectly depend from independent claims 1 and 12 are patentable over Franca-Neto, not only due to their respective dependence from claims 1 or 12, but also because such claims recite patentable subject matter in their own right.

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of claims 2, 4, 14 and 16, Applicant asserts that such claims are nonobvious with respect to the Franca-Neto/Ebihara combination for at least the reasons given above that Franca-Neto was deficient. Ebihara fails to remedy such deficiencies. Such dependent claims also recite patentable subject matter in their own right.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-4, 6-16 and 18-20 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §112 and §103(a) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,



William E. Lewis

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 39,274

Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP

90 Forest Avenue

Locust Valley, NY 11560

(516) 759-2946

Date: March 28, 2006